

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
GREENVILLE DIVISION

Billy J. Shirar,)	
)	Civil Action No. 6:07-3955-RBH-WMC
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	<u>REPORT OF MAGISTRATE JUDGE</u>
)	
Lieutenant Riley, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

The plaintiff brought this action seeking relief pursuant to Title 42, United States Code, Section 1983. On March 5, 2008, the defendants filed a motion for summary judgment. On March 6, 2008, pursuant to *Roseboro v. Garrison*, 528 F.2d 309 (4th Cir. 1975), the plaintiff was advised of the summary judgment procedure and the possible consequences if he failed to respond adequately. Despite this explanation, the plaintiff elected not to respond to the motion.

As the plaintiff is proceeding *pro se*, the court filed a second order on May 6, 2008, giving the plaintiff through May 30, 2008, to file his response to the motion for summary judgment. The plaintiff was specifically advised that if he failed to respond, this action would be dismissed for failure to prosecute. The plaintiff elected not to respond.

Based on the foregoing, it appears the plaintiff no longer wishes to pursue this action. Accordingly, it is recommended that this action be dismissed for lack of prosecution pursuant to Rule 41(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. *Ballard v. Carlson*, 882 F.2d 93 (4th Cir. 1989), *cert. denied*, 493 U.S. 1084 (1990).

s/William M. Catoe
United States Magistrate Judge

November 19, 2008
Greenville, South Carolina